

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claim 23 has been amended to additionally recite the features recited in claim 19, 20, and 21 which have been canceled. In addition, claim 23 has been amended to recite allowing a request to change the size of the file when it is determined that the request is made by the owner and denying the request to change the size of the file when it is determined that the request is not made by the owner of the file (see, for example, operations 520, 514 and 506 shown in Figure 5).

The Applicants reiterate arguments submitted in the Amendment dated December 22, 2005. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art does NOT teach or suggest:

(a) Identifying a region of the file which would be affected by changing the size of the file when it is determined that a mandatory Byte-Range lock has been associated with the file

It is noted that *Borr* states:

"Upon receiving a CIFS byte-range lock request message 140, the file server 110 tests the byte-range lock request for conflict with existing CIFS and NLM byte-range locks." (Col. 5, lines 58-61 of *Borr* cited on page 8 of the Final Office Action)

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that *Borr* does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

(b) *Borr* does NOT teach or suggest: receiving a request for changing the size of a file and determining whether the request was made by an owner of the lock that has been effectively implemented by a file-system independent component of the operating system, so that the changing of the size operation can be allowed if the request has been made by the owner of the file.

It is respectfully submitted that *Borr* does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

(c) *Samba 2.0* does NOT teach or suggest a file system independent component that effectively implements locks or a file system that does NOT provide mandatory locks


In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that Fig. 1-1 on page 4 of *Samba 2.0* describes this feature. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Fig. 1-1 of *Samba 2.0* depicts a simple network setup where "each of the computers listed share the same workgroup." *Samba* further describes: "A work-group is simply a group nametag that identifies an arbitrary collection of computers and their resources on an SMB network. There can be several workgroups on the network at any time, but for our basic network example, we'll have only one: the SIMPLE workgroup" (*Samba 2.0*, page 4). Clearly, the network setup of *Samba 2.0* does NOT teach this feature. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Samba 2.0* does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P722). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

  
R. Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300